arXiv:1403.0384v1 [quant-ph] 3 Mar 2014

A note on multi-time equations in quantum mechanics

Ali Sanayei

Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Tübingen

Auf der Morgenstelle 14, 72076 Tübingen, Germany

Email: ali.sanayei@uni-tuebingen.de

Abstract

The main aim of this note is to show that the formalism of multi-time equations in quantum mechanics meant to represent a manifestly Lorentz-invariant theory suffers from at least three imperfections: (1) It does not cover those physical systems for which the Schrödinger picture of quantum mechanics does not exist. (2) The integrabiliy condition which has been proposed in the formalism does not imply as necessary that for every partial Hamiltonian there exists a Schrödinger equation. (3) The formalism does not generally allow for interactions even in a non-relativistic multi-particle quantum system.

Recently, a formalism of multi-time equations involving several time variables, one for each particle, has been discussed [11] so that quantum mechanics can manifestly be Lorentz invariant. It was claimed that the relativistic analogue to a non-relativistic wave function $\psi(t; x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is a multi-time wave function $\phi(t_1, x_1; \ldots; t_n, x_n)$, on a set of space-like configurations, for which $\phi = \psi$ when $t_1 = \cdots = t_n = t$ [11]. Furthermore, it was claimed that the time evolution of ϕ is governed by the Schrödinger equation

$$i\partial_{t_j}\phi = \hat{\mathrm{H}}_j\phi \tag{1}$$

for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$, with partial Hamiltonians $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_j$ which (at least when all t_j are equal) add up to the full Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathrm{H}}$ fulfilling the Schrödinger equation

$$i\partial_t\psi = \hat{\mathrm{H}}\psi. \tag{2}$$

Moreover, the offered formalism refers to an integrability condition

$$\frac{\partial\hat{\mathrm{H}}_k}{\partial t_j} - \frac{\partial\hat{\mathrm{H}}_j}{\partial t_k} + i\left[\hat{\mathrm{H}}_j, \hat{\mathrm{H}}_k\right]_- = \hat{0} \tag{3}$$

and to a Stone-based theorem, whereby the partial Hamiltonians were assumed to be self-adjoint (see [11] and references therein). It was claimed that the system of equations (1) will then be consistent.

The aim of the present note is to show three points: (i) The formalism does not cover those physical systems for which Schrödinger picture of quantum mechanics does not exist. (ii) It is feasible to indicate a kind of decomposition of the full Hamiltonian for which (3) holds, however, (1) does not hold. (iii) Hence, the formalism only admits particular decompositions of a full Hamiltonian and even in this case does it not take into account interactions in the case of a non-relativistic multi-particle quantum system.

First, since the whole problem has been formalized in the Schrödinger picture, it is perhaps worth mentioning that Schrödinger picture and hence a Schrödinger equation governing a wave function do exist when the corresponding Hamiltonian is Hermitian. But it is possible to indicate physical systems for which the Schrödinger picture does not exist although the Heisenberg picture exists (see [7,8,9]). Such physical systems usually refer to those containing an infinite number of degrees of freedom [7,8]. More precisely, there are physical systems whose Hamiltonians together with boundary conditions are not Hermitian and therefore there is no Schrödinger equation to govern them. For instance, Gamow states which are wave functions of resonances are eigenvectors of a Hamiltonian possessing complex eigenvalues (e.g., see [10]). The dispersion phenomenon for nuclear reactions (Siegert states) [4] where the Hamiltonian together with the boundary conditions is not self-adjoint would be another example. A state vector of those systems moves about in a some more general space called the rigged Hilbert space. Thus, due to the fact that the basis of the formalism is the Schrödinger picture, it will automalically miss several real physical systems for which the Schrödinger picture does not exist.

Second, let us consider decomposition of a Hilbert space by direct sums. Thus, assume a Hermitian Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathrm{H}}$ (which is not an explicit function of time) in a full Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with two subspaces $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, where $\mathcal{B} = \bar{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{H} - \mathcal{A}$. Since $\hat{\mathrm{H}}$ is Hermitian, there exists a Schrödinger equation governing it. On the other hand, since $\mathcal{H}$ consists of two subspaces, the Schrödinger equation for $\hat{\mathrm{H}}$ can be represented as a matrix equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}} & \hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}} \\ \hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{B}\mathcal{A}} & \hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{B}\mathcal{B}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} |\psi_{\mathcal{A}}\rangle \\ |\psi_{\mathcal{B}}\rangle \end{bmatrix} = i\partial_t \begin{bmatrix} |\psi_{\mathcal{A}}\rangle \\ |\psi_{\mathcal{B}}\rangle \end{bmatrix}, \tag{4}$$

where $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}} = \hat{\mathrm{P}}_{\mathcal{A}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}\hat{\mathrm{P}}_{\mathcal{A}}$, $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{B}\mathcal{B}} = \hat{\mathrm{P}}_{\mathcal{B}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}\hat{\mathrm{P}}_{\mathcal{B}}$, $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}} = \hat{\mathrm{P}}_{\mathcal{A}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}\hat{\mathrm{P}}_{\mathcal{B}}$, $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{B}\mathcal{A}} = \hat{\mathrm{P}}_{\mathcal{B}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}\hat{\mathrm{P}}_{\mathcal{A}}$, $\hat{\mathrm{P}}_{\mathcal{A}} + \hat{\mathrm{P}}_{\mathcal{B}} = \hat{1}$, and $\hat{\mathrm{P}}$ denotes the orthogonal projection operator. It is straightforward then by (4) to show that:

$$\left(\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}} + \frac{\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{B}\mathcal{A}}}{i\partial_t - \hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{B}\mathcal{B}}}\right)|\psi_{\mathcal{A}}\rangle = i\partial_t\,|\psi_{\mathcal{A}}\rangle \tag{5}$$

Although the full Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathrm{H}}$ in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ fulfills the Schrödinger equation (2), (5) does not itself represent the Schrödinger equation for the partial Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}}$ because there exists a further perturbative term. Notwithstanding the fact that the integrability condition (3) holds, that is,

$$\left[\hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}}, \hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{B}\mathcal{B}}\right]_{-} = \left[\hat{\mathrm{P}}_{\mathcal{A}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}\hat{\mathrm{P}}_{\mathcal{A}}, \hat{\mathrm{P}}_{\mathcal{B}}\hat{\mathrm{H}}\hat{\mathrm{P}}_{\mathcal{B}}\right]_{-} = \hat{0}, \tag{6}$$

(1) does not necessarily hold for every partial Hamiltonian. If one takes Dirac-Frenkel variational principle [1,2] as a numerical approximation method whereby one assumes that the same full Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathrm{H}}$ holds in a subspace $\mathcal{V}$ of a full Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, even in this case there exists an error operator between the time derivative obtained in $\mathcal{H}$ and the time derivative obtained in $\mathcal{V}$.

Furthermore, conisder the decomposition of a Hilbert space by tensor products. Assume, for instance, two (isomorphic) Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ where $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$. Then the full Hermitian Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathrm{H}}$ in $\mathcal{H}$ can be represented by

$$\hat{\mathrm{H}} = \hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \hat{1} + \hat{1} \otimes \hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{B}} + \Im_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}}, \tag{7}$$

where $\Im_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}}$ denotes an arbitrary interaction. It is straightforward then by (2) and (7) to show that

$$i\partial_t \left(\psi_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \psi_{\mathcal{B}}\right) = \hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{A}}\psi_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \psi_{\mathcal{B}} + \psi_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \hat{\mathrm{H}}_{\mathcal{B}}\psi_{\mathcal{B}} + \Im_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}}\left(\psi_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes \psi_{\mathcal{B}}\right). \tag{8}$$

Equation (8) does not itself represent a Schrödinger equation for each partial Hamiltonian, unless one excludes the interaction $\Im_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{B}}$. Thus, if a decomposition of the full Hermitian Hamiltonian is carried out by tensor products such that the full Hamiltonian remains the time generator so as to have that (2) fulfilled, then it follows that (1) does not necessarily hold for every partial Hamiltonian, unless, that is to say, one excludes interactions in a multi-particle system.

To conclude, the formalism of multi-time equations in quantum mechanics [11] overlooks the class of physical systems for which Schrödinger picture does not exist. The integrability condition (3) does not necessarily imply that for an aribitrary decomposition of the Hilbert space (e.g., by direct sums) there exists a Schrödinger equation for every partial Hamiltonian. Even if one considers particular tensor product decomposition of a full Hermitian Hamiltonian, such that all partial Hamiltonians remain self-adjoint, one has to conclude that the formalism excludes and cannot cover interactions even in a non-relativistic multi-particle quantum system. Ultimately it is notable that, due to the fact that relative coordinates are not necessarily four-vectors, it is not possible to simply include interactions in relativistc quantum mechanics (as one does in non-relativisitc case) and get a manifestly Lorentz-invariant theory. This subtle point was already elucidated by Eddington and Dirac by their exchange notes through the Society [3,5,6].

Acknowledgements

I thank Nils Schopohl and Michael Benner for discussions.

References

[1] P.A.M. Dirac, Note on exchange phenomena in the Thomas atom, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **26**, (1930) 376-385.

[2] J. Frenkel, *Wave Mechanics*, 2nd edn. (Oxford University Press, 1936).

[3] A. Eddington, Lorentz-invariance in quantum theory, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **35**, (1939) 186-194.

[4] A.J.F. Siegert, On the derivation of the dispersion formula for nuclear reactions, *Phys. Rev.* **56**, (1939) 750-752.

[5] P.A.M. Dirac, R. Peierls and M.H.L. Pryce, On Lorentz invariance in the quantum theory, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **38**, (1942) 193-200.

[6] A. Eddington, On Lorentz-invariance in the quantum theory. II, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **38**, (1942) 201-209.

[7] P.A.M. Dirac, Foundations of quantum mechanics, *Nature*. **203**, (1964) 115-116.

[8] P.A.M. Dirac, Quantum electrodynamics without dead wood, *Phys. Rev.* **139**, (1965) 684-690.

[9] N. Moiseyev, *Non-Hermitian Quantum Mechanics*, 1st edn. (Cambridge University Press, 2011).

[10] R. de la Madrid, The rigged Hilbert space approach to the Gamow states, *J. Math. Phys.* **53**, (2012) 102113.

[11] S. Petrat and R. Tumulka, Multi-time equations, classical and quantum, *Proc. R. Soc. A* **470**, (2014) 20130632.